

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE DISTRICT OF DELAWARE

POWER INTEGRATIONS, INC., a
Delaware corporation,

Plaintiff,

v.

FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR
INTERNATIONAL, INC., a Delaware
corporation, and FAIRCHILD
SEMICONDUCTOR CORPORATION, a
Delaware corporation,

Defendants.

C.A. No. 04-1371 JJF

**POWER INTEGRATIONS' [PROPOSED] SPECIAL VERDICT AND
INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY - VALIDITY**

We, the jury, unanimously find as follows:

VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '851 PATENT

1. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '851 Patent is anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 1: YES _____ NO _____

Claim 4: YES _____ NO _____

2. If you answered "YES" to question 1, indicate claim by claim below any reference you have determined anticipates any claim of the '851 Patent.

3. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '851 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of one or more of the asserted prior art references, and therefore the claim is invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 1: YES _____ NO _____

Claim 4: YES _____ NO _____

4. If you answered "YES" to question 3, indicate claim by claim below which reference(s) you have relied upon in determining any claim of the '851 Patent was obvious.

VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '366 PATENT

5. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '366 Patent is anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 9: YES _____ NO _____

Claim 14: YES _____ NO _____

6. If you answered "YES" to question 5, indicate claim by claim below any reference you have determined anticipates any claim of the '366 Patent.

7. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '366 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of one or more of the asserted prior art references, and therefore the claim is invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 9: YES _____ NO _____

Claim 14: YES _____ NO _____

8. If you answered "YES" to question 7, indicate claim by claim below which reference(s) you have relied upon in determining any claim of the '366 Patent was obvious.

VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '876 PATENT

9. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 1 of the '876 Patent is anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

YES _____ NO _____

10. If you answered "YES" to question 9, indicate below any reference you have determined anticipates claim 1 of the '876 Patent.

11. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that Claim 1 of the '876 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of one or more of the asserted prior art references, and therefore the claim is invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

YES _____ NO _____

12. If you answered "YES" to question 11, indicate below which reference(s) you have relied upon in determining Claim 1 of the '876 Patent was obvious.

VALIDITY OF POWER INTEGRATIONS' '075 PATENT

13. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that claim 1 of the '075 Patent is anticipated and therefore invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

YES _____ NO _____

14. If you answered "YES" to question 13, indicate below any reference you have determined anticipates claim 1 of the '075 Patent.

15. Do you find by clear and convincing evidence that any of the following claims of the '075 Patent would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention in view of one or more of the asserted prior art references, and therefore the claim is invalid? (A "YES" answer is a finding for Fairchild. A "NO" answer to this question is a finding for Power Integrations.)

Claim 1: YES _____ NO _____

Claim 5: YES _____ NO _____

(FORM CONTINUES ON NEXT PAGE)

16. If you answered "YES" to question 15, indicate claim by claim below which reference(s) you have relied upon in determining any claim of the '075 Patent was obvious.

You must each sign this Verdict Form: Dated: _____

_____ (foreperson)	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____
_____	_____

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on September 7, 2007, I electronically filed with the Clerk of Court **POWER INTEGRATIONS' [PROPOSED] SPECIAL VERDICT AND INTERROGATORIES TO THE JURY - VALIDITY** using CM/ECF which will send electronic notification of such filing(s) to the following counsel. In addition, the filing will also be sent in the manner indicated:

BY HAND

Steven J. Balick, Esq.
John G. Day, Esq.
Ashby & Geddes
500 Delaware Avenue, 8th Floor
Wilmington, DE 19899

Attorneys for Defendants
FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR
INTERNATIONAL, INC. and
FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR
CORPORATION

BY EMAIL AND FEDERAL EXPRESS

G. Hopkins Guy, III
Gabriel M. Ramsey
Orrick, Herrington & Sutcliffe, LLP
1000 Marsh Road
Menlo Park, CA 94025

Attorneys for Defendants
FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR
INTERNATIONAL, INC. and
FAIRCHILD SEMICONDUCTOR
CORPORATION

/s/ William M. Marsden, Jr.

William J. Marsden, Jr. (marsden@fr.com)